IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NORTH AMERICAN SOCCER LEAGUE, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

UNITED STATES SOCCER FEDERATION, INC. and MAJOR LEAGUE SOCCER, L.L.C.,

Defendants.

Case No.: 1:17-cv-05495-HG

VERDICT FORM

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. <u>Your answer to each question must be unanimous</u>.

* * *

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows on the questions submitted to us, and we return them as our verdict in this case:

PART I: DIVISION 1

Question No. 1:

Did North American Soccer League prove the existence of one or both of the following relevant antitrust markets:

(a)	The market	t for Division	1 sanctions	s for me	ı's profe	essional	soccer	leagues	located	in
	the United S	States and Car	nada?							

YES____NO___

(b) The market for team membership in a Division 1 men's professional soccer league located in the United States and Canada?

YES_____ NO____

If "YES," to either subpart (a) or (b) please proceed to **Question 2**.

If "NO," to both subparts (a) and (b) please proceed to PART II: DIVISION 2 (page 7).

COUNTS AGAINST U.S. SOCCER FEDERATION AND MAJOR LEAGUE SOCCER

Count 1 (Conspiracy to Restrain Trade in Division 1)

Question No. 2:

(a) Answer this question **only** if you answered yes to **Question 1(a)**:

Did North American Soccer League prove that U.S. Soccer Federation and Major League Soccer knowingly participated in a conspiracy to unreasonably restrain trade in the market for Division 1 sanctions for men's professional soccer leagues located in the United States and Canada?

YES NO

(b) Answer this question **only** if you answered yes to **Question 1(b)**:

Did North American Soccer League prove that U.S. Soccer Federation and Major League Soccer knowingly participated in a conspiracy to unreasonably restrain trade in the market for team membership in a Division 1 men's professional soccer league located in the United States and Canada?

YES NO

If "YES," to either subpart (a) or (b) please proceed to Question 3.

If "NO," to both subparts (a) and (b) please proceed to Question 4.

Question No. 3:

(a) Answer this question **only** if you answered yes to **Question 2(a)**:

Did North American Soccer League prove that it suffered injury to its business or property that was materially caused by the conspiracy by U.S. Soccer Federation and Major League Soccer to unreasonably restrain trade in the market for Division 1 sanctions for men's professional soccer leagues located in the United States and Canada?

(b) Answer this question **only** if you answered yes to **Question 2(b)**:

Did North American Soccer League prove that it suffered injury to its business or property that was materially caused by the conspiracy by U.S. Soccer Federation and Major League Soccer to unreasonably restrain trade in the market for team membership in a Division 1 men's professional soccer league located in the United States and Canada?

YES	NO

Please proceed to Question 4.

Count 2 (Conspiracy to Monopolize Division 1)

Question No. 4:

Did North American Soccer League prove that U.S. Soccer Federation and Major League Soccer entered into a conspiracy with the specific intent of monopolizing the relevant market for team membership in a Division 1 sanctioned men's professional soccer league in the United States and Canada?

Office States and Canada:
YES NO
If "YES," please proceed to Question 5.
If "NO," please proceed to Question 7.
Question No. 5:
Did North American Soccer League prove that, as a result of a conspiracy by U.S. Soccer Federation and Major League Soccer, there was substantial harm to competition in that relevant market?
YESNO
If "YES," please proceed to Question 6.
If "NO," please proceed to Question 7.
Question No. 6:
Did North American Soccer League prove that it suffered injury to its business or property that was materially caused by this conspiracy?
YES NO
Please proceed to Question 7.

COUNTS AGAINST MAJOR LEAGUE SOCCER ONLY

Count 3 (Monopolization Division 1)

Question No. 7:

Did North American Soccer League prove that Major League Soccer both possessed monopoly power in the relevant market for team membership in a Division 1 sanctioned men's professional soccer league in the United States and Canada, and willfully obtained or maintained such monopoly power by engaging in anticompetitive conduct?

	YES	NO			
If "YES," please proc	reed to Questi	ion 8.			
If "NO," please proce	eed to Questic	on 9.			
Question No. Did North Amproperty that was mat	nerican Soccer erially caused YES	by this an	ticompetiti	•	
Please proceed to Qu	estion 9.				

Count 4 (Attempted Monopolization Division 1)

Question No. 9:

Did North American Soccer League prove that Major League Soccer attempted to monopolize the market for team membership in a Division 1 sanctioned men's professional soccer league located in the United States and Canada by engaging in anticompetitive conduct?

YES	NO	

If "YES," please proceed to Question 10.

If "NO," please proceed to Question 11.

Question No. 10:

Did North American Soccer League prove that it suffered injury to its business or property that was materially caused by this anticompetitive conduct of Major League Soccer?

Please proceed to Question 11.

DAMAGES (DIVISION 1)

If you answered "YES" to any of Questions 3(a), 3(b), 6, 8, or 10, please proceed to Question 11 to determine damages.

If you answered "NO," or did not provide answers to, Questions 3(a), 3(b), 6, 8, and 10, please proceed to PART II: DIVISION 2.

Question No. 11:

What amount of damages did North American Soccer League prove that it suffered as a result of the conduct you found violates antitrust law, specifically in connection with the denial of its Division 1 sanctioning application for the 2016 season?

\$							
Ψ							

If you awarded any damages related to Division 1, please proceed to PART III (page 11).

If you did not award Division 1 damages, please proceed to PART II: Division 2 on the following page.

PART II: DIVISION 2

Question No. 12:

Did North American Soccer League prove the existence of one or both of the following relevant antitrust markets:

` /	t for Division 2 States and Can	2 sanctions for men's professional soccer leagues located in ada?
	YES	NO
` '	t for team mem the United State	bership in a Division 2 men's professional soccer league es and Canada?
	YES	NO
If "YES," to either sub	bpart (a) <u>or</u> (b)	please proceed to Question 13.
If "NO," to both subp	arts (a)	please proceed to PART III (page 11).

COUNTS AGAINST U.S. SOCCER FEDERATION AND MAJOR LEAGUE SOCCER

Count 1 (Conspiracy to Restrain Trade in Division 2)

Quest	ion N	lo. 13:

(a) Answer this question <u>only</u> if you answered yes to <u>Question 12(a)</u>:

Did North American Soccer League prove that U.S. Soccer Federation and Major League Soccer knowingly participated in a conspiracy with non-defendant United Soccer League to unreasonably restrain trade in the market for Division 2 sanctions for men's professional soccer leagues located in the United States and Canada?

YES NO

(b) Answer this question <u>only</u> if you answered yes to <u>Question 12(b)</u>:

Did North American Soccer League prove that U.S. Soccer Federation and Major League Soccer knowingly participated in a conspiracy with non-defendant United Soccer League to unreasonably restrain trade in the market for team membership in a Division 2 men's professional soccer league located in the United States and Canada?

If "YES," to either subpart (a) or (b) please proceed to Question 14.

If "NO," to both subparts (a) <u>and</u> (b) please proceed to Question 15.

Question No. 14:

(a)	Answer this	question (only if yo	ou answered	yes to	Question	13((a)

Did North American Soccer League prove that it suffered injury to its business or property that was materially caused by the conspiracy by U.S. Soccer Federation, Major League Soccer, and non-defendant United Soccer League to unreasonably restrain trade in the market for Division 2 sanctions for men's professional soccer leagues located in the United States and Canada?

YES NO

(b) Answer this question <u>only</u> if you answered yes to <u>Question 13(b)</u>:

Did North American Soccer League prove that it suffered injury to its business or property that was materially caused by the conspiracy by U.S. Soccer Federation, Major League Soccer and non-defendant United Soccer League to unreasonably restrain trade in the market for team membership in a Division 2 men's professional soccer league located in the United States and Canada?

YES NO

Please proceed to Question 15.

Count 2 (Conspiracy to Monopolize Division 2)

Question No. 15:

Did North American Soccer League prove that U.S. Soccer Federation, Major League Soccer, and non-defendant United Soccer League entered into a conspiracy with the specific intent of monopolizing the relevant market for team membership in a Division 2 sanctioned men's professional soccer league in the United States and Canada?

If "YES," please proceed to Question 16.

If "NO," please proceed to Question 18.

Did North American Soccer League prove that, as a result of a conspiracy by U.S. Soccer Federation, Major League Soccer, and non-defendant United Soccer League there was substantial harm to competition in that relevant market?
YES NO
If "YES," please proceed to Question 17.
If "NO," please proceed to Question 18.
Question No. 17:
Did North American Soccer League prove that it suffered injury to its business or property that was materially caused by this conspiracy?
YES NO
Please proceed to Question 18.
DAMAGES (DIVISION 2)
If you answered "YES" to any of Questions 14(a), 14(b), <u>or</u> 17, please proceed to Question 18 to determine damages.
If you answered "NO," or did not provide answers to, Questions 14(a), 14(b), <u>and</u> 17, please proceed to PART III (page 11).
Question No. 18:

Please proceed to PART III on the following page.

its Division 2 sanctioning application for the 2018 season?

What amount of damages did North American Soccer League prove that it suffered as a result of the conduct you found violates antitrust law, specifically in connection with the denial of

<u>PA</u>	RT	Π

Your deliberations are complete.	Please sign the verdict form below.	
Signed:		
Jury Foreperson		